arXiv:1403.5235v2 [math.CV] 31 Mar 2014

PSEUDO-ISOMORPHISMS IN DIMENSION 3 AND APPLICATIONS TO COMPLEX MONGE-AMPERE EQUATION

TUYEN TRUNG TRUONG

Abstract. Let X and Y be compact Kähler manifolds of dimension 3. A bimeromorphic map $f : X \to Y$ is pseudo-isomorphic if $f : X - I(f) \to Y - I(f^{-1})$ is an isomorphism.

In this paper we investigate some properties of pseudo-isomorphisms. As an application, we associate to any pseudo-isomorphism in dimension 3 and a smooth closed $(3,3)$ form δ on $X \times X$ representing the cohomology class of the diagonal Δ_X, a Monge-Ampere operator $MA(f^*(\theta), \delta) = f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta)$, here θ is a smooth closed $(1,1)$ form on Y. We show that this Monge-Ampere operator is independent of the choice of δ, if the following cohomologous condition is satisfied:

Condition. For any curve $C \subset I(f^{-1})$, we have $\{\theta\}.\{C\} = 0$ in cohomology.

We conclude the paper examining a simple pseudo-isomorphism in dimension 3.

1. Introduction

Let X and Y be compact Kähler manifolds of dimension 3. A bimeromorphic map $f : X \to Y$ is pseudo-isomorphic if the map $g = f|_{X-I(f)} : X - I(f) \to Y - I(f^{-1})$ is an isomorphism. We let $\Gamma_g \subset (X - I(f)) \times (Y - I(f^{-1}))$ be the graph of g, and $\Gamma_f =$ the closure of Γ_g in $X \times Y$ the graph of f. Let $\pi_1, \pi_2 : \Gamma_f, \Gamma_g \to X, Y$ be the natural projections.

For a meromorphic map, Meo [6] defined the pullback of a positive closed $(1,1)$ current and a quasi-psh function. In [8], we showed that for a pseudo-isomorphism in dimension 3, we can pullback and pushforward any positive closed $(2,2)$ currents. Moreover, these pullback and pushforward are continuous with the weak topology on currents.

In this paper, we investigate further properties of pseudo-isomorphisms and give applications to complex Monge-Ampere operators in dimension 3.

Our first results are the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a pseudo-isomorphism in dimension 3.*

Let T_1 and T_2 be differences of positive closed $(1,1)$ currents which are smooth outside a curve. Then the currents $f^*(T_1) \wedge f^*(T_2)$ and $f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2)$ are well-defined. (The first one being by dimension reason, the second one following [9, 8]. Please see the proof of the theorem for more details.)

The difference current $f^*(T_1) \wedge f^*(T_2) - f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2)$, which has support in $I(f)$, depends only on the cohomology classes of T_1 and T_2.

Moreover, if for every curve $C \subset I(f^{-1})$ we have in cohomology: $\{T_1\}.\{C\} = 0$, then $f^*(T_1) \wedge f^*(T_2) - f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2) = 0$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let u be a quasi-psh function on X and T a positive closed $(1,1)$ current on Y which is smooth on $Y - C$ where C is a curve which is not contained in $I(f^{-1})$. Then*

the current $uf^*(T)$ is well-defined on X. Moreover, the current $\pi_1^*(uf^*(T))$ has bounded mass on Γ_g.

By Theorem 1.2, we can extend the current $\pi_1^*(uf^*(T))$ on Γ_g by zero to Γ_f. We denote this current by $(\widetilde{\pi_1^*(uf^*(T))} \wedge [\Gamma_g])$. We then define for any smooth function ϕ on X

$$f_*(\varphi dd^c uf^*(T)) := (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1^*(\varphi)dd^c(\widetilde{\pi_1^*(uf^*(T))} \wedge [\Gamma_g])). \tag{1.1}$$

In case u is a smooth function, the definition in Equation (1.1) may be different from the correct value

$$(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1^*(\varphi)dd^c(\pi_1^*(uf^*(T)) \wedge [\Gamma_f])). \tag{1.2}$$

However, under one cohomologous condition, Equations (1.1) and (1.2) are the same.

Theorem 1.3. *Assumptions are as in Theorem 1.2. Moreover, assume that u is smooth, and either*

(i) $dd^c u = 0$,

or

(ii) for any curve C in the indeterminate set $I(f^{-1})$, we have in cohomology $\{T\}.\{C\} = 0$.

Then Equations 1.1 and 1.2 are the same.

As an application, we define the Monge-Ampere operators $MA(f^*(\theta)) = f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta)$, where θ is a smooth closed $(1,1)$ form, as follows. We write $f^*(\theta) = \Omega + dd^c u$, where Ω is a smooth closed $(1,1)$ form and u is a quasi-psh function on X. If φ is a smooth function on X then we define

$$< f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta), \varphi >:= \int_Y \varphi f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta) \wedge \Omega + \int_Y \theta \wedge f_*(\varphi dd^c uf^*(\theta)). \tag{1.3}$$

Here $f_*(\varphi dd^c uf^*(\theta))$ is defined in Equation (1.1).

Remark 1. The Monge-Ampere defined above is correct in cohomology, that is the total mass of $MA(f^*(\theta))$ is the same as the intersection in cohomology $\{f^*(\theta)\}.\{f^*(\theta)\}.\{f^*(\theta)\}$.

Theorem 1.4. *For a fixed choice of Ω, the Monge-Ampere operator defined in Equation (1.3) is independent of the choice of the quasi-potential u.*

Moreover, the Monge-Ampere operator is independent of Ω, if the following cohomologous condition is satisfied: for every curve $C \subset I(f^{-1})$, then in cohomology $\{\theta\}.\{C\} = 0$.

Remark 2. Given a smooth closed $(3,3)$ form δ on $X \times X$ which is cohomologous to the diagonal Δ_X, we have a uniform choice of a smooth representing $\Omega_{\delta,T}$ of positive closed $(1,1)$ currents T on X by the following formula

$$\Omega_{\delta,T} := (\pi_1)_*(\pi_2^*(T) \wedge \delta).$$

Here $\pi_1, \pi_2 : X \times X \to X$ are the natural projections.

Therefore, we have the following definition

Definition 1.5. Let $f : X \to Y$ be a pseudo-isomorphism in dimension 3. Let δ be a smooth closed $(3,3)$ form on X having the same cohomology class as that of the diagonal Δ_X.

We define the Monge-Ampere operator $MA(f^*(\theta), \delta)$ by the following formula

$$< MA(f^*(\theta), \delta), \varphi >:= \int_Y \varphi f^*(\theta) \wedge f^*(\theta) \wedge \Omega_{\delta, f^*(\theta)} + \int_Y \theta \wedge f_*(\varphi dd^c u f^*(\theta))$$

Here $f^*(\theta) = \Omega_{\delta, f^*(\theta)} + dd^c u$.

By Theorem 1.4, this is independent of the choice of u.

In the last Section, we will apply Theorem 1.4 to a specific pseudo-automorphism J_X in dimension 3. We obtain the following result

Theorem 1.6. *Let $J_X : X \to X$ be the pseudo-automorphism considered in Section 3.*

1) There is a unique non-zero cohomology class $\eta \in H^{1,1}(X)$ such that if θ is a smooth closed $(1,1)$ form for which the Monge-Ampere operator $MA(., \delta)$ in Definition 1.5 is independent of the choice of δ, then in cohomology $\{\theta\}$ is a multiple of $\{\eta\}$.

Moreover, the class η is nef.

2) There is a positive closed smooth $(1,1)$ form θ on X such that for every choice of δ then the Monge-Ampere operator $MA(f^*(\theta), \delta)$ is a signed measure with support in $I(f)$ and with total mass -3.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Eric Bedford, Tien-Cuong Dinh, Mattias Jonsson, Nessim Sibony and Yuan Yuan for their crucial comments. The author also would like to thank Muhammed Alan for helpful discussions on the topic.

2. Proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let Z be a resolution of singularity of the graph Γ_f of f, and let $\pi, h : Z \to X, Y$ be the induced holomorphic maps to the source and the target. We can choose π such that it is a composition of blowups at a smooth point or curve $\pi = \pi_m \circ \circ \dots \pi_2 \circ \pi_1$, and moreover, the images by π and h of the exceptional divisor of π are contained in $I(f)$ and $I(f^{-1})$.

1) We first prove part 1) in the case T_1 and T_2 are smooth closed $(1,1)$ forms. Then

$$f^*(T_1) = \pi_* h^*(T_1), \ f^*(T_2) = \pi_* h^*(T_2), \ f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2) = \pi_*(h^*(T_1) \wedge h^*(T_2)).$$

Here $\pi_* = (\pi_1)_* \circ \dots (\pi_m)_*$. Define Since $\alpha = h^*(T_1)$ and $\beta = h^*(T_2)$. These are smooth closed $(1,1)$ forms on Z.

a) First, consider the blowup π_1. If π_1 is blowup at a point then there is nothing to prove. Hence we consider the case π_1 is the blowup at a smooth curve D_1. Let F_1 be a fiber of the restriction of π_1 to the exceptional divisor $\pi_1^{-1}(D_1)$. by Lemma 4 in [7] we have

$$(\pi_1)_*((\pi_1)^*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge \beta) - (\pi_1)_*(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \{\alpha.F_1\}\{\beta.F_1\}[D_1]. \tag{2.1}$$

Therefore the current $(\pi_1)_*((\pi_1)^*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge \beta) - (\pi_1)_*(\alpha \wedge \beta)$ depends only on the cohomology classes of α and β, therefore depends only on the cohomology classes of T_1 and T_2.

We now claim that the currents $(\pi_1)_*((\pi_1)^*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge \beta)$ and $(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\beta)$ are the same. In fact, the currents $(\pi_1)_*(\alpha)$ and $(\pi_1)_*(\beta)$ are are differences of positive closed $(1,1)$ currents which are smooth outside a curve, so the intersection $(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\beta)$ is well-defined (see Section 4, Chapter 3 in [4]). If we consider a smooth approximation S_n of $(\pi_1)_*(\alpha)$, then $(\pi_1)^*(S_n) \wedge \beta$ converges to $(\pi_1)^*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge \beta$, therefore

$$(\pi_1)_*((\pi_1)^*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge \beta) = \lim_{n \to \infty} (\pi_1)_*(\pi_1^*(S_n) \wedge \beta) = \lim_{n \to \infty} S_n \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\beta) = (\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\beta).$$

The second equality follows from the projection formula, and the third equality follows if we choose S_n good enough.

Therefore, we showed that the current

$$(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\beta) - (\pi_1)_*(\alpha \wedge \beta)$$

depends only on the cohomology classes of T_1 and T_2.

b) We consider the second blowup π_2. Here we can not apply directly Lemma 4 in [7] since now $(\pi_1)_*(\alpha)$ and $(\pi_1)_*(\beta)$ are not smooth. However, we can approximate $(\pi_1)_*(\alpha)$ by smooth closed $(1,1)$ forms S_n and $(\pi_1)_*(\beta)$ by smooth closed $(1,1)$ forms R_n. Then each term

$$(\pi_2)_*(S_n) \wedge (\pi_2)_*(R_n) - (\pi_2)_*(S_n \wedge R_n)$$

depends only on the cohomology classes of S_n and R_n. Hence the limit depends only on the cohomology classes of T_1 and T_2. We now show that $(\pi_2)_*(S_n) \wedge (\pi_2)_*(R_n)$ converges to $(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\beta)$. Note that again, $(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha)$ and $(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\beta)$ are smooth outside a curve, so their wedge product is well-defined. We can choose S_n with the following properties: $S_n = \Omega_n + dd^c u_n$, where Ω are smooth closed $(1,1)$ form converging uniformly to a C^2 closed (1,1) form, and u_n are differences of quasi-psh functions converging locally uniformly outside a curve. We can choose R_n such that it converges locally uniformly outside a curve. Then an argument similar to that in proof of Lemma 5 in [8] shows that the sequence $u_n R_n$ converges (the sequence converges locally uniformly outside a curve, and the limit has no mass on curves because of the dimension reason). It follows that $S_n \wedge R_n = \Omega_n \wedge R_n + dd^c(u_n R_n)$ converges, and the limit is exactly $(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\beta)$.

By a similar argument, we can show that $(\pi_2)_*(S_n \wedge R_n)$ converges to $(\pi_2)_*((\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\beta))$. Combining with Step a) we conclude that the current

$$(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha) \wedge (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\beta) - (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1)_*(\alpha \wedge \beta)$$

depends only on the cohomology classes of T_1 and T_2.

c) Working inductively on the number of blowups, we conclude that for smooth closed $(1,1)$ forms T_1 and T_2

$$f^*(T_1) \wedge f^*(T_2) - f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2)$$

depends only on the cohomology classes of T_1 and T_2.

2) Consider the general case. Since T_1 and T_2 are smooth outside a curve, so is $f^*(T_1)$ and $f^*(T_2)$. Therefore $f^*(T_1) \wedge f^*(T_2)$ is well-defined. Since $T_1 \wedge T_2$ is a positive closed $(2,2)$ current, $f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2)$ is well-defined as shown in [9, 8]. Moreover, if we approximate T_1 and T_2 by appropriate smooth closed $(1,1)$ forms S_n and R_n (for examples like the ones used in the proof of Step b)), then $f^*(S_n \wedge R_n)$ converges to $f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2)$ and $f^*(S_n) \wedge f^*(R_n)$ converges to $f^*(S_n) \wedge f^*(R_n)$. Here we use that since f is a pseudo-automorphism in dimension 3, if Sn converges locally uniformly outside a curve, then so is $f^*(S_n)$. Also, if Ω_n converges uniformly to Ω, then $f^*(\Omega_n - \Omega) \wedge f^*(R_n)$ converges to 0.

3) We now prove the last assertion of Theorem 1.1. From Equation (2.1), it follows that if in cohomology $\{h^*(\mathbb{T}_1)\}.\{D\} = 0$ for every curve D in the exceptional divisors of the holomorphic map $\pi : Z \to X$, then $f^*(T_1) \wedge f^*(T_2) - f^*(T_1 \wedge T_2) = 0$. Since

$$\{h^*(T_1)\}.\{D\} = \{T_1\}.h_*\{D\},$$

and $h(D)$ is contained in $I(f^{-1})$, if $\{T_1\}.\{C\} = 0$ for every curve C in $I(f^{-1})$ then we also have $\{h^*(T_1)\}.\{D\} = 0$ as wanted.

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** The pullback of a positive closed $(1,1)$ current and of a quasi-psh function is given by Meo [6]. Since $f^*(T)$ is smooth outside $f^{-1}(C)$ which is a curve (here we use that f is a pseudo-isomorphism), the current $uf^*(T)$ is well-defined on $X - f^{-1}(C)$ (see e.g. Section 4, Chapter 3 in Demailly [4]). Since $f^{-1}(C)$ has codimension at least 2, we can extend $uf^*(T)$ to be a negative $(1,1)$ current on X. Moreover, $dd^c(uf^*(T))$ is a difference of two positive closed $(2,2)$ currents, hence it is DSH as defined in Dinh-Sibony [2, 3].

We now show that the mass of $\pi_1^*(uf^*(T))$ is bounded on Γ_g. Let ω_X and ω_Y be Kähler forms on X and Y. Since $\pi_1^*(\omega_X) + \pi_2^*(\omega_Y)$ is a Kähler form on $X \times Y$, it suffices to show that each of the following integrals

$$\int_{\Gamma_g} \pi_1^*(uf^*(T)) \wedge \pi_1^*(\omega_X^2), \ \int_{\Gamma_g} \pi_1^*(uf^*(T)) \wedge \pi_1^*(\omega_X) \wedge \pi_2^*(\omega_Y), \ \int_{\Gamma_g} \pi_1^*(uf^*(T)) \wedge \pi_2^*(\omega_Y^2)$$

is bounded.

The first term

$$\int_{\Gamma_g} \pi_1^*(uf^*(T)) \wedge \pi_1^*(\omega_X^2) = \int_{X - I(f)} uf^*(T) \wedge \omega_X^2$$

is clearly bounded. This follows from the Oka's principle, see Fornaess-Sibony [5]. Here $uf^*(T)$ is a DSH (1,1) current on $X - I(f)$, and $I(f)$ is of dimension 1 which is smaller than the dimension of $uf^*(T)$. Therefore $uf^*(T)$ extends uniquely as a DSH $(1,1)$ current on Y. A similar argument was used in the proofs of Theorem 6 in [9] and Lemma 5 in [8].

The second term

$$\int_{\Gamma_g} \pi_1^*(uf^*(T)) \wedge \pi_1^*(\omega_X) \wedge \pi_2^*(\omega_Y) = \int_{Y - I(f^{-1})} f_*(u\omega_X) \wedge T \wedge \omega_Y$$

is also bounded. Here we use that $f_*(f^*(\theta)) = \theta$ on $Y - I(f^{-1})$, since f is an isomorphism from $X - I(f)$ to $Y - I(f^{-1})$. Let $A \subset I(f^{-1})$ be the finite set where T is not smooth. Since T is smooth on $Y - A - C$ by assumption and $f_*(\omega_X)$ is smooth outside $I(f^{-1})$, the current $f_*(u\omega_X) \wedge T$ is well-defined on $Y - A$ as a DSH $(2,2)$ current. The Oka's principle again implies that we can extend $f_*(u\omega_X) \wedge T$ uniquely as a DSH current on all of Y.

The last term

$$\int_{\Gamma_g} \pi_1^*(uf^*(\theta)) \wedge \pi_2^*(\omega_Y^2) = \int_{Y - I(f^{-1})} f_*(u)T \wedge \omega_Y^2$$

is also bounded.

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Let $\pi, h : Z \to X, Y$ be the maps given in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Since f is a pseudo-isomorphism, we can choose such that if D is a curve in the exceptional divisor of π then $\pi(D)$ is contained in $I(f)$ and $h(D)$ is contained in $I(f^{-1})$.

We can write

$$\pi^*(f^*(T)) = h^*(T) + \sum_j \lambda_j [V_j],$$

where V_j are irreducible components of the exceptional divisor of π, and λ_j are constants.

We note that $h^*(T) = h^o(T) + \sum_{j'} \lambda_{j'}[V_{j'}]$. Here $h^o(T)$ is the strict transform of T hence has no mass on proper analytic sets, and V_j are subvarieties of dimension 2 in the exceptional divisor of π such that $h(V_j')$ is a point. Therefore, for a smooth function u, the difference between Equations (1.1) and (1.2) is

$$\sum_j \lambda_j h_*(\pi^*\varphi \wedge \pi^* dd^c u[V_j]).$$

Therefore, the difference is 0 when either the restriction of $dd^c u = 0$ to the exceptional divisor is 0, or $\lambda_j = 0$ for all j.

Assumption (i) of the theorem implies $dd^c u = 0$. We now show that condition (ii) is equivalent to $\lambda_j = 0$ for all j.

It is known that the cohomology classes of the irreducible components of the exceptional divisor of π are linearly independent, see Proposition 5.5 in Dinh-Sibony [3]. Therefore, to show that $\lambda_j = 0$ for all j, it suffices to show that $\pi^*(f^*(T)) - h^*(T) = 0$ in $H^{1,1}(Z)$. By Poincaré duality, we only need to show that for any $\eta \in H^{2,2}(Z)$ we have

$$\{\pi^*(f^*(T)) - h^*(T)\}.\eta = 0.$$

Since $\pi : Z \to X$ is a composition of blowups, we can write $\eta = \pi^*\xi + \{D\}$, where $\xi \in H^{2,2}(X)$ and D is a linear combination of curves in the exceptional divisor of π.

By the projection formula

$$\{\pi^*(f^*(T)) - h^*(T)\}.\pi^*(\xi) = \pi_*\{\pi^*(f^*(T)) - h^*(T)\}.\xi = 0.$$

The second equality follows since by definition $\pi_*(h^*(T)) = f^*(T)$.

Now let D be a curve in the exceptional divisor of π. By the choice of the desingularization Z, $\pi(D)$ is contained in $I(f)$ and $h(D)$ is contained in $I(f^{-1})$. Therefore, both $f_*\pi_*\{D\}$ and $h_*\{D\}$ are cohomologus to a linear combination of curves in $I(f^{-1})$. We have by assumption (ii) of the theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \{\pi^*(f^*(T))\}.\{D\} &= \{T\}.f_*\pi_*\{D\} = 0, \\ \{h^*(T)\}.\{D\} &= \{T\}.h_*\{D\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the proof of Theorem 1.3 is completed.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.4.** a) Fixed a smooth closed $(1,1)$ form Ω such that $f^*(\theta) = \Omega + dd^c u$. If we choose another quasi-potential u' so that $f^*(\theta) = \Omega + dd^c u'$ then $u - u' = \phi$, where ϕ is a smooth function and $dd^c\phi = 0$. Condition (i) of Theorem 1.3 is satisfied, hence the difference when we define the Monge-Ampere operator using either u or u' is 0.

b) Now assume that $\{\theta\}.\{C\} = 0$ for every curve in $I(f^{-1})$. Assume that we have $f^*(\theta) = \Omega + dd^c u = \Omega' + dd^c u'$, then $u - u' = \phi$ is a smooth function. Condition (ii) if Theorem 1.3 is satisfied, therefore again we have that the difference when defining Monge-Ampere using either Ω or Ω' is 0.

3. An example

3.1. **The map J_X.** We consider a special Cremona transform which we will discuss in this Subsection. The material is taken from [9].

Let X be the blowup of $\mathbb{P}^3$ along 4 points $e_0 = [1:0:0:0], e_1 = [0:1:0:0], e_2 = [0:0:1:0], e_3 = [0:0:0:1]$; $J : \mathbb{P}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ is the Cremona map $J[x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3] = [1/x_0 : 1/x_1 : 1/x_2 : 1/x_3]$, and let J_X be the lifting of J to X. For $0 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$, $\Sigma_{i,j}$ is the line in $\mathbb{P}^3$ consisting of points $[x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3]$ where $x_i = x_j = 0$, and $\widetilde{\Sigma_{i,j}}$ is the strict transform of $\Sigma_{i,j}$ in X.

Let E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3 be the corresponding exceptional divisors of the blowup $X \to \mathbb{P}^3$, and let L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3 be any lines in E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3 correspondingly. Let H be a generic hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^3$, and let H^2 be a generic line in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Then H, E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3 are a basis for $H^{1,1}(X)$, and H^2, L_0, L_1, L_2, L_3 are a basis for $H^{2,2}(X)$. Intersection products in complementary dimensions are:

$$\begin{aligned}
&H.H^2 = 1,\ H.L_0 = 0,\ H.L_1 = 0,\ H.L_2 = 0,\ H.L_3 = 0,\\
&E_0.H^2 = 0,\ E_0.L_0 = -1,\ E_0.L_1 = 0,\ E_0.L_2 = 0,\ E_0.L_3 = 0,\\
&E_1.H^2 = 0,\ E_1.L_0 = 0,\ E_1.L_1 = -1,\ E_1.L_2 = 0,\ E_1.L_3 = 0,\\
&E_2.H^2 = 0,\ E_2.L_0 = 0,\ E_2.L_1 = 0,\ E_2.L_2 = -1,\ E_1.L_3 = 0,\\
&E_3.H^2 = 0,\ E_3.L_0 = 0,\ E_3.L_1 = 0,\ E_3.L_2 = 0,\ E_3.L_3 = -1.
\end{aligned}$$

The map $J_X^* : H^{1,1}(X) \to H^{1,1}(X)$ is not hard to compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_X^*(H) &= 3H - 2E_0 - 2E_1 - 2E_2 - 2E_3,\\
J_X^*(E_0) &= H - E_1 - E_2 - E_3,\\
J_X^*(E_1) &= H - E_0 - E_2 - E_3,\\
J_X^*(E_2) &= H - E_0 - E_1 - E_3,\\
J_X^*(E_3) &= H - E_0 - E_1 - E_2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $x \in H^{1,1}(X)$ and $y \in H^{2,2}(X)$, since $J_X^2 =$the identity map on X, we have the duality $(J_X^* y).x = y.(J_X^* x)$. Thus from the above data, we can write down the map $J_X^* : H^{2,2}(X) \to H^{2,2}(X)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_X^*(H^2) &= 3H^2 - L_0 - L_1 - L_2 - L_3,\\
J_X^*(L_0) &= 2H^2 - L_1 - L_2 - L_3,\\
J_X^*(L_1) &= 2H^2 - L_0 - L_2 - L_3,\\
J_X^*(L_2) &= 2H^2 - L_0 - L_1 - L_3,\\
J_X^*(L_3) &= 2H^2 - L_0 - L_1 - L_2.
\end{aligned}$$

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.6.** 1) Let $\pi : Z \to X$ be the blowup at the curves $\widetilde{\Sigma_{i,j}}$. Then the induced map $J_Z : Z \to Z$ is an automorphism. If we let $g = \pi \circ J_Z : Z \to X$ then the data (Z, π, g) is one that we can choose to start the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Considering the proof of Theorem 1.4 carefully for this choice of Z, it is not difficult to conclude that for a smooth closed $(1,1)$ form θ on X, the Monge-Ampere operator $MA(J_X^*(\theta), \delta)$ is independent of the choice of δ if and only if the following condition is satisfied:

Condition (C): In cohomology, $\{\theta\}.\{\widetilde{\Sigma_{i,j}}\} = 0$ for all i, j.

With the data given in Subsection 3.1, we can check easily that Condition (C) is satisfied if and only if $\{\theta\} = 0$ is a multiple of $2H - E_0 - E_1 - E_2 - E_3$. The latter cohomology class can be checked to be nef, by considering intersection with curves in X.

2) Let X_1 be the blowup of $\mathbb{P}^3$ at $[1:0:0:0]$. Then it is known that there is a fibration $X_1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$. We then let Π be the composition of this map with the projection from X to X_1.

Let h be a generic line in $\mathbb{P}^2$. Then in cohomology $\Pi^*(h) = H - E_0$ where H is a generic hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^3$ and E_0 is the fiber over $[1:0:0:0]$. Hence

$$J_X^*\Pi^*(h) = J_X^*(H - E_0) = 2H - 2E_0 - E_1 - E_2 - E_3.$$

From the intersection on X, we have

$$J_X^*\Pi^*(h).J_X^*\Pi^*(h).J_X^*\Pi^*(h) = 8H^3 - 8E_0^3 - E_1^3 - E_2^3 - E_3^3 = -3.$$

We then choose $\theta = \Pi^*(\omega_{\mathbb{P}^2})$ where $\omega_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ is the Fubini-Study form on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Then $\theta \wedge \theta \wedge \theta = 0$.

On $X - I(f)$ then $MA(f^*(\theta), \delta) = f^*(\theta \wedge \theta \wedge \theta) = 0$. Therefore the support of the measure $MA(f^*(\theta), \delta)$ is contained in $I(f)$. The total mass of this measure is the intersection in cohomology $\{f^*(\theta)\}.\{f^*(\theta)\}.\{f^*(\theta)\} = -3$.

References

[1] **Note.** More relevant references will be added later.

[2] T-C Dinh and N. Sibony, *Regularization of currents and entropy,* Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. (4), 37 (2004), no 6, 959–971.

[3] T-C Dinh and N. Sibony, *Pull-back of currents by holomorphic maps,* Manuscripta Math. 123 (2007), no 3, 357–371.

[4] Jean-Pierre Demailly, *Complex analytic and differential geometry,* Online book, version of Thursday 10 September 2009.

[5] J. E. Fornaess and N. Sibony, *Oka's inequality for currents and applications,* Math. Ann. 301 (1995), 399–419.

[6] Michel Meo, *Inverse image of a closed positive current by a surjective analytic map,* (in French), C. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math. 322 (1996) , no 12, 1141–1144.

[7] truong2T. T. Truong, *The simplicity of the first spectral radius of a meromorphic map*, Michigan Math. Journal, accepted. Preprint arXiv: 1212.1019.

[8] T.T. Truong, : *Some dynamical properties of pseudo-automorphisms in dimension* 3, accepted in Transactions of the American Mathematical Society. arXiv:1304.4100.

[9] T.T. Truong, : *Pullback of currents by meromorphic maps*, preprint. To appear in Bulletin de Societe Mathematiques de France.

Department of Mathematics, Syracuse University, Syracuse NY 13244

E-mail address: tutruong@syr.edu